DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 194 673 UD 021 033

AUTHOR Johnson, Nancy K.; Gardner, Cynthia H.
TITLE Toward a Prototype for Training Classroom Ethnographers.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO UTR&D-R-5066
PUB DATE 8 Apr 79
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 8-12, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Observation Techniques; Classroom Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethnography; Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Researchers; *Research Methodology; Research Needs; *Social Science Research; *Training Methods

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a model for a systematic method of training field workers in classroom research projects. The model was found to be necessary because classroom ethnographers have to hire and train others to gather data for research. According to this model, people are hired on the basis of personal skills in interpreting events and are trained by staff researchers in understanding ethnographic research and the immediate research goals. A period of time is then spent in the field, practicing data collection and comparing notes to establish validity and identify critical events. The training procedures incorporate theoretical constructs from cultural anthropology and apply them to investigations requiring classroom observation. (MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SEP 9 - 1980

ED194673

8

for Apr '79

Toward a Prototype for Training Classroom Ethnographers

NANCY K. JOHNSON

CYNTHIA H. GARDNER

Research and Development Center
for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

R&D Rep. No. 5066
April 8, 1979

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Walton
Texas University, Austin
Research & Development Center for Teacher Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE021033

This study was supported in part by Contracts and Grants from the National Institute of Education to The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education and no official endorsement by that office should be inferred.

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, April 8-12, 1979.

Toward a Prototype for Training Classroom Ethnographers

NANCY K. JOHNSON and CYNTHIA H. GARDNER

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

Time, money and other constraints often force classroom ethnographers to hire and train others to gather the data required by their research goals. In the model for a systematic, replicable method for training field ethnographers described in this report, people are hired on the basis of personal skills in interpreting events, trained by staff researchers for two weeks in understanding ethnographic research in general and the immediate research goals, and then spend two weeks in the field "practicing" and comparing field notes with staff and each other to establish validity and identify critical events.

JUL 3 1980

Toward a Prototype for Training Classroom Ethnographers

Nancy K. Johnson and Cynthia H. Gardner

In this paper we describe a process for training ethnographers to participate in classroom field research. The training procedure incorporates theoretical constructs from cultural anthropology and applies them to heuristic investigations requiring observation and documentation of the events of classroom life. Further, it is an attempt to identify the components of classroom ethnography and to demonstrate how each of these components was conveyed to the individuals we trained to be members of an ethnography team in an ongoing study. Although every research endeavor utilizing ethnographic techniques will be idiosyncratic in terms of research design and goals, the approach presented here captures various threads of methodological commonality which should help to standardize training people to utilize this useful research tool.

It is our contention that ethnography is a method which has certain discrete properties and which should be used for particular kinds of educational research. It seems particularly suited to exploratory, or hypothesis-generating research in education. Wolcott suggests that "ethnography is best served when the researcher feels free to 'muddle about' in the field setting and to pursue hunches or to address himself to problems that he deems interesting and worthy of sustained attention" (1975, p. 133). Increasingly wide acceptance and use of ethnographic methods in classroom studies, however, have raised some issues not usually faced by the classical cultural ethnographer, and not yet dealt with successfully by the classroom ethnographer.

Cultural anthropologists generally choose the settings they wish to study; they immerse themselves totally in the settings for long periods of time. Most important for making sense of the data, they follow it through from collection, through analysis, to interpretation--a practice which lends itself to the emergence from the data itself of patterns and possibilities for further study.

The most fruitful application of the ethnographic method to classroom studies may be the classical one. In fact, there are those anthropologists who insist that much classroom ethnography, especially that which is characterized by divisions in the labor from data collection through interpretation, is a distortion of the method in principle and in practice. Ethnography that deserves the name, they say, represents an intensive personal involvement in the daily life of the culture under investigation. The investigator should commit a certain amount of time (a year is customary; for briefer periods, Wolcott [1975, p. 118] suggests matching each day of field work with a day for organization and writing) to observing the interactions within the target culture from the various perspectives of the participants.

Further, anthropological fieldwork requires a "willing suspension of disbelief" such that the ethnographer explores all aspects of the target community, filtering the information only inasmuch as physical constraints require. All things (observed events and perceived impressions) are data, and it is the omniscient ethnographer's responsibility to observe and record these data over time, from an "emic" or insider's perspective, yet with a distanced eye which allows recognizing patterns and critical events, constructing categories and hypotheses, and finding meaning through the vigorous interpretation of a classificatory scheme.

Researchers who wish to use ethnography in the classroom, however, often face time, money, contractual, and other constraints that preclude studies of the scope and open-endedness described above. The person who conceptualizes the study may not be able to collect all the data, and may not even analyze it. In a large scale project in which the investigators conducting the research cannot do all the ethnography, other personnel must be selected and trained to collect data in the field in a manner intended by the researchers to perceive incidents which are critical to the goals of the research.

The training method described here was designed to accommodate both the scope of the fieldwork and the other research commitments of the investigators who conceptualized the project. It was necessary for the research staff to hire field ethnographers to assist in observing the classrooms under investigation and to interview the teachers and students participating in the study.

Several studies (Tikunoff, Berliner, & Rist, 1975; Evertson & Anderson, 1978) have developed sets of guidelines for their ethnographers, and at least one major effort (Studying Schools as Social Systems, 1975) has been made to establish procedures and materials for the general education of school ethnographers, but to our knowledge, a systematic, replicable method for training classroom observers to utilize ethnographic techniques in a focused study does not exist. Our purpose in a study which is currently underway in second grade classrooms was to develop such a method.

Forming the Ethnography Team

After consulting the theoretical and technical reports prepared by other classroom ethnographers, we developed a set of objectives for training field ethnographers. Conveying the ethnographic approach in cookbook fashion, however, was neither an accessible, nor an attractive prospect.

Ethnographic research is an approach to looking at the world that defies reduction to a sequence of steps to follow. This is mainly because ethnography derives meaning from more than observable behavior. One trains a quantitative coder how to use the system; in ethnography, the "coder" is the system.

Most of the procedures we developed to hire and train our assistant ethnographers depended on their receptivity to the notion of participating directly in decisions about what to regard as data. In the training of coders using a preconceived set of behaviors and descriptors, numerical correlates of observable student and teacher behaviors are presented for memorization and facile assignation. When a certain reliability coefficient is reached, the coders are considered to be in agreement. The data in the case of coding are the numbers one ascribes to interactive events, not the events themselves.

One can easily see the appeal of this approach. To researchers with an eye toward organizing and analyzing the data, it is infinitely preferable to work with numbers than with reams of narrative text. As for the training of the observers, coding is systematically taught, and the successful teaching of coding skills is mechanically evaluated.

Because ethnography is an elusive art, it requires that the ethnographers accept a certain amount of ambiguity in the initial stages of dealing with the data. Ethnographers, like coders, transform the data as soon as they begin to observe and filter events, but their attention to contextual features and functions of the interaction enables--in fact forces--them to arrive at a more complete (though less accessible) account of those events.

The qualities we looked for in applicants for the three ethnographic positions required by our study were suggested partly by a review of the

literature on field studies that involved training hired observers (such as Tikunoff et al., 1975; Evertson & Anderson, 1978) partly by the theoretical literature about school ethnography and its practitioners (such as Wilson, 1977; Wolcott, 1975; Hymes, 1978); and partly by our own biases and the focus of the study. Since fundamentally we felt that good ethnographers are born and not made, we were much more interested in persons who could convince us they had a natural aptitude for accurate, sensitive, and empathetic observation than in those with any particular high professional qualifications. Cross-cultural experience was desirable, but in its absence we were prepared to settle for well-educated people with a wide range of interests, in whom we intended to implant or cultivate a cross-cultural perspective (cf. Wolcott, 1975, p. 116). In addition to indicating a high level of intellectual curiosity, the presence of these qualities held promise for our anticipated future use of the ethnographers in participating in the generation of hypotheses from their own and one another's data. It seemed safe to assume that a knowledgeable person with a wide academic and personal perspective would be more likely to follow the data where it led rather than to try to make it conform to a preconceived framework or yield pet hypotheses.

The uniformly high caliber of the people who were interviewed threw the final decision onto the interviewers' own judgment that the person hired was exceptionally perceptive, curious, and able to view events objectively as well as interpret them according to the different perspectives and underlying intentions of the participants. The three people who best met the requirements were a graduate student in sociology, one in anthropology, and an educational psychology major, all of whom were working on advanced degrees, and all of whom, we felt, had high potential for working closely with others as a team. Further, each ethnographer convinced us by the questions they asked in the interview that they found the project to be inherently interesting; their

articulate e[illegible]oration of the proposed method in this initial discussion indicated their capa[illegible] to use language precisely and to approach the problem with creativity.

Ethonographer Training

In the fall of 1978 the Evaluation of Teaching (EOT) program at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education began a field research study in second grade reading classes. The study was designed to accommodate two purposes: (1) to compare three techniques for collecting data according to their methodological properties and potential, and (2) to compile a quantity of data on provocative components of student and teacher interaction in reading instruction which would stimulate topics for further research.

The first purpose of the study, the methodological aspect, required that we distinguish the three data collection techniques so that they might be compared and contrasted for the quantity and quality of information provided by each one. Besides ethnography, we enlisted (1) a standard, preconceived coding instrument to document frequencies and direction of student-teacher interaction, and (2) videotaping. The second purpose of the study, to generate hypotheses, required that we train some people to look at and record what goes on in classrooms.

The training of the ethnographers took place over a period of four weeks early in the fall before the field study was to begin. Two EOT staff members who had extensively researched ethnography conducted the sessions devoted to ethnography itself. A consultant from the College of Education at The University of Texas was hired to talk to the ethnographers about the teaching of reading, one of the areas upon which the study would focus. An EOT staff member whose primary research interest is student self-concept, the other focus of the study, was engaged to conduct several sessions on the psychological dimensions of self-concept. Two EOT staff members with expertise in interviewing techniques contributed their services to that aspect of training.

The training was structured so that instructional sessions and reading assignments alternated with periods during which the ethnographers could discuss the possible impact of the information they had received on their focus, objectivity, interpretive arsenal, and pre-existing biases. Typically, these discussions continued until all agreed that at least a convergence of opinion had been reached. Our overall goal in these discussions was to ensure that the ethnographers understood and agreed on the nature of the ethnographer's job, her role in the classroom, her responsibility as a recording instrument, and her power as interpreter or selector of events.

The ethnographers were urged to contribute from their experience and professional backgrounds to these sessions (which they were not shy about doing) and their input to the training enriched everyone's understanding of the processes we were all studying.

In the next section we present what we consider the crucial objectives for training classroom ethnographers and the specific steps that we took to implement them. The procedure that emerged is as much a result of the commitment of the trainees as of the planning of the staff that trained them. Throughout the training we tried to foster an atmosphere of confidence in the method of inquiry and trust in the ethnographers' abilities to critically evaluate their biases and judgments. What the trainers contributed to the training was information, guided discussion, and procedural suggestion. What emerged was an ethnography team with undeniable, though difficult to measure, technical and perceptual skills and with, in the words of one ethnographer, "the convergent orientation necessary to a unified research project."

Objective One: To facilitate an understanding of the conceptual focus of the research study.

The extent to which trainers will equip the ethnographers with the appropriate "conceptual baggage" (Lutz & Ramsey, 1974, p. 6) will vary with

the research design. In our case, a pilot study of student self-concept in the context of reading class, in which the purpose was to generate hypotheses for further research, this meant initially discussing our principle interest in relationships between self-concept and reading not as hypotheses to be tested but as a focus of observation.

Typically, the traditional cultural ethnographer who enters the field with no hypotheses nevertheless addresses some feature of the target culture, such as farming practices or family relationships. This approach constrains (or focuses) the investigation only in that it defines the set of events which are to be considered for analysis. The cultural anthropologist's approach does not limit the problem to be studied to a particular hypothesis about those events; rather, it leaves the identification of problems to the investigator's discretion.

In a typical quantitative research study utilizing assistants to collect data, the assistants are not informed of the empirical hypothesis if there is a possibility of biasing the collection of data. The coder in classroom interaction research fulfills a mechanical function, using a preconceived coding or other observation instrument to document events pertaining to a predetermined empirical hypothesis.

Ethnographic research, on the other hand, makes no pretense of eliminating bias in the data collection. Although the ethnographic narratives should be clear and accurate, they will, by their very nature, reflect the point of view and tone of the narrator. Thus the discussion of theoretical concepts which the designers of the research have taken into account is indeed appropriate. Assuming that the group of ethnographers is to share as much as possible a collective knowledge base, the biases they appeal to in describing and categorizing events should also be made explicit during the training.

We addressed this issue with a three-pronged attack. (1) The ethnographers were given a theoretical foundation from the literature concerning self-concept and a mini-course in the theory and practice of teaching reading. (This was to acquaint them with our "bias.") (2) An exercise was conducted in which typical classroom events were submitted to each ethnographer for interpretation according to a scale of categories especially revelatory of bias. (This was to make them more sensitive to their own biases.) (3) A number of discussions were held in which the ethnographers explored their personal biases together. These conversations continued throughout the training, and, as biases became easier to identify, they also became less troublesome as the ethnographers' understanding of the goals and spirit of qualitative observation grew, as they assimilated our research focus, and as they began to draw together as a team. It made sense to us that if the group could work closely together during the training and during the initial stages of the field work, the ethnography team, though varied in personal background and philosophical bent, should be able to approach the research focus from a fundamentally shared perspective.

A description of the reading mini-course follows, to illustrate our intent in the first prong of the attack and how we tried to accomplish it.

Believing, along with Tikunoff et al. (1975, p. 20) that it would be useful if a "facet of training focused on classroom practices that ethnographers might commonly find in the teaching of reading [and, in the case of Tikunoff et al., mathematics]....to help sharpen the ethnographers' observation of reading [and mathematics] teaching," we took steps to acquaint the ethnographers with a number of concepts, procedures and techniques of teaching reading. However, we further hypothesized that an intense mini-course in reading theory and practice would not only <u>not</u> divert their attention from ethnographic techniques (cf. Tikunoff et al., 1975, p. 20), but would serve to sensitize the ethnographers in a common way to those

moments in the classroom when teachers are making choices that affect how and when and how much students read.

A three-hour training session was conducted by an expert in reading instruction from the College of Education at The University of Texas. The ethnographers received a concentrated course in the theory and practice of teaching reading distilled by the consultant from his own courses taught to education students. The range of possible approaches and methods to teaching and learning reading was presented. The ethnographers learned that emphasis in the early years of reading instruction is on skills and practice; teachers generally have access to a variety of paced materials to provide practice, and to follow in guiding students through a prescribed scope and sequence of skills acquisition. The ethnographers were explicitly alerted to points at which teachers make decisions that determine how these approaches, methods, materials, scopes, and sequences are applied; for example, teachers decide the proportion of time spent in the classroom on skills or on practice; and they decide where to place a student in the program. Teachers also sometimes participate in the selection of the particular reading program and frequently are free to adopt or reject aspects of a program based on their assessments of their students' abilities and needs. Discussion during this facet of the training brought out other decision-points that might be better observed by someone familiar with the options and resources available to teachers.

Somewhat on the other side of this same coin, we hypothesized that knowing what kinds of objectives teachers have in reading and the approaches, methods, and materials available to them would help free the observers to focus directly on interactions, incidents, and events in the classroom and

in the reading group without being confused or distracted by the continuous barrage of jargon, procedures, and other formal activities engendered by the particular reading program being used.

In summary, we hypothesized that a background in reading theory and teaching reading practice would facilitate the ethnographers' interpretations of levels of behavior, from the formal implementation of a reading program to the teaching of a "hidden curriculum" (LeCompte, 1978, p. 29).

In the same way, our self-concept expert presented a model of the dimensions of self-concept (Kash & Borich, 1978), and the ethnographers practiced identifying teacher and student behaviors that exhibited those dimensions in videotapes and written vignettes. Here again our goal was to sensitize the ethnographers to the possible levels of interpretation of what they saw, and to focus their attention on perceiving interactions in terms that were germane to the study.

Objective Two: To establish the technique and intellectual orientation for a common ethnographic approach.

Classroom ethnographers do not "live" in schoolrooms; they cannot approach the cultural anthropologist's experience in becoming part of the informants' world. Furthermore, when the cultural anthropologist enters the field for the first time, the differences between that culture and the anthropologist's are overwhelming. At once beginning a cross-cultural comparison, the field worker notes striking characteristics of the target culture merely by contrasting them with elements in his/her own. The classroom ethnographer, having spent much of her life being socialized in the culture of the schoolroom, may find the first field encounter somewhat less than remarkable. (Foley, D. Personal communication, September, 1978). Upon her first observation, the classroom ethnographer

typically will remark upon the similarities between superficial aspects of classroom life "today" and those she recalls from her own personal experience. To see beyond these superficial similarities and the apparent unremarkableness of classroom life requires a set of tools borrowed from cultural anthropology. To equip our ethnographers with those tools we followed Tikunoff et al.'s (1975) lead in having them study and evaluate Jules Henry's cross-cultural classification, in addition to some other readings we considered essential for background for "really looking" in classrooms (see Appendix A for readings).

One of the most important features of the classroom ethnographer's approach is attention to interpreting events according to the various frames of reference of the participants. Documentation of interaction is viewed as complete only when it has been considered from the points of view of the teacher and the students. If the teacher moves a student from one position in the room to another, for example, the ethnographer is obliged to evaluate the event in the context of the increasingly global knowledge she holds concerning those students and that teacher. She must ask the question, "what did the teacher intend; how did the student perceive the event; how did the event function in the minds of the other members of the class; and, how did the event operate within the rules for social organization as they exist in the classroom culture?" If the event is deemed significant because of some incompatibility within this framework, or if it is idiosyncratic when compared across classrooms, it becomes salient and should be categorized for further investigation. In the case of the teacher telling the student to move, the ethnographer should look for other instances of seating changes, should try to characterize the rule for seating assignments if it appears implicit, or describe it if it has been made an explicit part of the classroom organization.

The following questions exemplify part of what we thought our ethnographers should look for. They were given this list to consider after their first field observations.

1. What does the teacher do consistently that gets a particular response? What are the reasons?
2. What kind of atmosphere is created? How?
3. Is learning happening?
4. What is most of the time being spent on?
5. Are children on-task, probably on-task, off-task, probably off-task?
6. What is the task?
7. Do the children know what the task is?
8. What clues does the teacher give you regarding her self-concern?
9. Where is her concern focused?
10. What kind of tone of voice does she use?
11. Does it vary with (1) kids, (2) other factors?
12. How does the teacher establish order?
13. How are classroom decisions made?
14. How does the teacher let children know when their behavior (content related or otherwise) is acceptable? Unacceptable?

Each question has at its base a particular notion concerning characteristics of classroom interaction we felt were important. Yet the purpose of presenting them was to enable the ethnographers to look sensitively at classroom events so they could formulate their own hypotheses, not to support or reject any hypotheses of ours. Not only did we have to trust in them, but they had to trust our emergent design as well as be confident in their own capabilities for jumping head-first into a sea of data.

We encouraged our ethnographers to begin making their own "little hypotheses" as soon as they felt comfortable in the field. Once a hypothesis was formulated, we suggested they look for evidence to support or reject it, exercising great care to consider all possible explanations for the interaction and its resolution. Further, they should avoid allowing their speculations to lead them too far astray from the total understanding they were attempting. The classroom provides an abundance of tempting tangents; at all times the observer should keep eyes open to peripheral episodes and cues.

Objective Three: To instruct the ethnographers in ethnographic techniques.

When it was apparent that the trainees were grasping the principles of ethnography, the trainers introduced field note procedure. Practical considerations dictated some of the rules of narrative writing: for example, write continuously to keep the teacher and students from being self-conscious about certain events, and so incidents could be recorded verbatim as they occurred. The requirements of future analysis (and the inherent appropriateness of ethnography for those purposes) guided our instructions for note taking in general: that the narratives must be lengthy and rich enough to provide a "wealth of primary data" and allow the emergence of categories; that events should be analyzable as discrete; and that there be a theoretical saturation of categories (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 111) to support the eventual generation of hypotheses.

More specifically, the ethnographers were instructed to try to capture the backgound for critical incidents that was not amenable to coding by quantitative methods, including, for example, different points of view, possible interpretations of incidents in light of prior knowledge about teacher or students (or their relationships), and nonverbal exchanges that might support or contradict or shed light on other interactions. This

was, of course, in addition to and along with the ongoing description of the room (seating, grouping, etc.), the students (ethnicity, sex, etc.), the teacher (tone of voice, position, time spent at desk, etc.) and the concrete activities and verbal interactions participants engaged in as they occurred.

The ethnographers were also urged to make a continuous record of their own inferences, hunches, perceptions of emergent patterns, theoretical comments and so forth, separate from the narrative. We designed a tentative format partially to accommodate several other data collection techniques being used in the same classrooms (some additional small bits of information other than straight narratives would be required) but mainly to satisfy these needs of narrative description and inferential aside. The format evolved somewhat during training; it appears in Appendix B in its final form. The ethnographer was to write what she saw "going on" in the class on the right side of the narrative sheet. On the left side she was to write anything else: inferences, impressions, interpretations, opinions, reservations, sketches, weather reports--whatever could not somehow be construed to be "objective" description.

The time was to be noted with some frequency--about every 5 minutes if possible--to establish an index for comparing paired narratives, and to mark transitions in classroom activities.

We adopted Tikunoff et al.'s (1975) noise level rating scale for our first narratives:

Noise Level 0 = silence, or teacher or one student talking during a lesson

Noise Level 1 = normal hum of working classroom

Noise Level 2 = higher than average; intrusive; above teacher's tolerance level

But the ethnographers discovered in the field that it failed to capture several of the nuances of classroom noise. A new scale was devised based on their field experiences which is presently being used in the study:

0 = Silent

1 = Small amount of noise

2 = Noise acceptable to teacher

3 = Noise acceptable to teacher but becomes salient to observer

4 = Noise becomes salient (unacceptable) to teacher

In addition to their narrative texts, we asked the ethnographers to tape record a synthesis of each observation. This was to provide them an opportunity to fill in gaps or further elucidate events in their narratives, to describe atmosphere and other intangibles, and to explore their mini-hypotheses. It also gave them a chance to reflect on their language: the not-quite appropriate word seized in haste while writing a narrative could be replaced or supplemented by a more precise one in the taped description.

Additional information will be collected from the students and teachers through interviews conducted by the ethnographers. Training was conducted by EOT staff members on two days for a total of three hours. Emphasis was placed on student interviewing techniques. Training procedures followed those usually used in the research interview (Cannel & Kahn, 1968; Evertson & Anderson, 1978; Hyman, Cobb, & Feldman, 1954; Loucks, Newlove, & Hall, 1975).

Interviewing techniques were discussed, including methods of focusing, narrowing, and broadening responses. For example, the use of "how" and "why" questions was suggested following "yes" and "no" questions. The interviewers were encouraged to probe for detail.

Each interviewer was then assigned to interview two 6 or 7 year-old children. Tapes of these practice sessions were discussed and feedback

was provided including suggestions on ways of improving their interviewing techniques.

Objective Four: To establish reliability among the ethnographers.

As stated previously, reliability among ethnographers cannot be achieved to the degree attained by coders using a predetermined set of behavioral items. This is an admitted limitation of the ethnographic method, but it does not detract significantly from the benefits ethnography provides. One way that we ensured cohesion among the ethnography team was through the close personal relationship we established, meeting frequently for feedback and discussion of mutual concerns.

The most important consideration for research terms utilizing ethnography is to maintain communication between the staff and hired ethnographers. Just as observers using preconceived coding instruments achieve higher reliability when communication between coders is permitted during the observation (cf. Marston, et al., 1978), ethnographers' performance can and should be checked through continued discussion of their observations with the staff who trained them. The reports they produce may also be compared to see if they conform to the norm established during training. Initiated in our training through discussion and documentation of videotaped vignettes, pairs of ethnographers (one staff, one hired) continued throughout the project to observe the classrooms on a regular basis, but less frequently than the individual hired ethnographers observed. The protocols recording these sessions were compared for scope, detail, and interpretation and were submitted to other members of the program staff for periodic scrutiny.

As another exercise toward reliability, each ethnographer viewed a videotape of a class documented in person by another member of the team. The two protocols were compared for the reasons mentioned above, as well

as to determine the differences between the documents of two field workers with comparable skills, but with differing degrees of knowledge about the diachronic classroom events.

As alluded to in the section on techniques, one of the chief considerations for any research design utilizing ethnography is that once abstraction from the data begins, one must control as much as possible the language used to document events. Descriptions should be accurate and vocabularly precise enough for an independent observer to be able to reconstruct the events from the ethnographic documents. As Wolcott observes,

> A deceptively simple test for judging the adequacy of an ethnographic account is to ask whether a person reading it could subsequently behave appropriately as a member of the society or social group about which he has been reading, or, more modestly, whether he can anticipate and interpret what occurs in the group as appropriately as its own members (1975, p. 112).

We found our ethnographers' narratives and tapes passed the test. Even the clerical assistants who transcribed the ethnographers' taped syntheses of each observation remarked upon the intimacy with the classroom situations they felt they derived from their association with the tapes they listened to.

Conclusion

Since our study required coordinating concurrent observations by both ethnographers and coders (and, periodically, videotapers) we were obliged to conform to a stricter time schedule than good classroom ethnography should. Although the ethnographers in our study observed their classrooms for one school year, they observed reading class only, and saw each teacher just

twice a month. This is a point at which we deviate most profoundly from the classical anthropological method, and we consider it a limitation of our research methodology. Yet over the course of the year, the ethnographers admitted to an intense involvement with the lives of the students and teachers in their classrooms. One ethnographer enrolled in a course in qualitative research in education so that she could pursue a particular focus that was not a concern of our research design (and one of the staff ethnographers sat in on the university course being attended by the hired ethnographer so that knowledge base could be shared by other members of the team). Another ethnographer "discovered" the topic for her dissertation while observing the classroom in our study. We encouraged these pursuits, reasoning that more intense involvement could only produce a more complete picture of classroom life.

References

Cannell, C.F., & Kahn, R.L. Interviewing. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of social psychology (2nd ed.) Vol. 2. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Evertson, C.M., & Anderson, L.M. Interim progress report: The classroom organization study. Correlates of Effective Teaching Program, The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, Report #6002, January 1978.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. The discovery of grounded theory. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1967.

Hyman, H.H., Cobb, W.M., Feldman, J.J., Hart, C.W., & Stember, C.H. Interviewing in social research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Hymes, D. What is ethnography: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory Austin, Texas, Sociolinguistic Working Paper #45, April 1978.

Kash, M.M., & Borich, G.D. Teacher behavior and pupil self-concept. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1978.

LeCompte, M. Learning to work: The hidden curriculum of the classroom. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 1978, 9, 22-37.

Loucks, S.F., Newlove, B.W., & Hall, G.E. Measuring levels of use of the innovation: A manual for trainers, interviewers, and raters. Austin, Texas: The University of Texas at Austin Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1975.

Lutz, F.W., & Ramsey, M.A. The use of anthropological field methods in education. Educational Researcher, 1974, 3, 5-9.

Marston, P.T., Kugle, C.L., & Zimmerer, L.K. Coder drift: A reliability problem for teacher observations. Austin, Texas: The University of Texas at Austin Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1978.

Studying Schools as Social Systems: A Manual for Field Research in Education. Instructors' Manual. Columbia University: Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute for School Experimentation, 1975.

Tikunoff, W.J., Berliner, D.C., & Rist, R.C. An Ethnographic Study of the Forty Classrooms of the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study Known Sample. Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Cal., Technical Report #75-10-5, Special Study A, October 1, 1975.

Wilson, S. The use of ethnographic techniques in educational research. Review of Educational Research, 1977, 47, 245-265.

Wolcott, H. Criteria for an ethnographic approach to research in schools. Human Organization, 1975, 34, 111-128.

Appendix A

Bibliography of Readings Assigned to Ethnographer Trainees, in Order of Assignment

Appendix A

Bibliography of Readings Assigned to Ethnographer Trainees, in Order of Assignment

Henry, J. A cross-cultural outline of education. Current Anthropology, 1960, 1, 267-305.

Rist, R. Ethnographic techniques and the study of an urban school. Urban Education. 1975, 10, 86-108.

Smith, L., & Geoffrey, W. The nature of classroom microethnography. In The complexities of an urban classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.

McDermott, R.P. Social relations as contexts for learning in school. Harvard Educational Review, 1977, 47, 198-213.

Wolcott, H.F. The ideal world and the real world of reading: An anthropological perspective. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 060 393)

Appendix B

Narrative Sheet

Date_____ Class_____
Coder_____
Time_____ Page___ of____

Noise: 0 = Silent
1 = Small amount of noise
2 = Noise acceptable to teacher
3 = Noise acceptable to teacher but becomes salient to observe
4 = Noise becomes salient (unacceptable) to teacher

INFERENCES	TIME	SRI - START	NOISE LEVEL	